Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D.C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. III, NO. 31, *Issue Number* 131, JULY 31, 1946 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

JAPAN'S NEW FREEDOM

By Kiyoshi K. Kawakami

The Soviet propaganda offensive in Japan, now causing something of a rift among the Allied occupation authorities at Tokyo, poses a grave question involving freedom of the press, of speech and assembly, of thought and religious belief. It is a question which must not and cannot be so lightly disposed of as does the New York Times by saying editorially: "The sooner General MacArthur puts an end to this [Russian propaganda] the better for all concerned."

If the Soviet liaison mission at Tokyo draws from the Allied authorities exorbitant sums and diverts, as is generally assumed, a substantial portion of the funds (which must eventually be paid by the Japanese themselves) to finance Japanese fifth columns in the form of Communist publications and organizations -- if the Russian mission stoops to this morally indefensible practice, then the occupation administration must and will cut down its future appropriations.

This, however, is a relatively unimportant matter. The important question is whether Red propaganda can be stopped, and if so, how. Russia has never stinted money or pains on foreign propaganda. The paring down of Allied appropriations, for Soviet operations in Japan, would of itself cause Moscow little embarrassment.

Much more fundamental is the question whether an attempt to suppress propaganda, Red, Pink or White, can ever be justified on the ground of wisdom. Never effective, suppression usually forces open and relatively harmless propaganda to go underground and become dangerous.

II

The Allies themselves seem to recognize the unwisdom of suppressive policy. They have rescued the freedom of speech from the strangling hands of Japanese militarists and restored it to the people of Japan. Communists and Socialists, as well as Liberals and Conservatives, have in effect been invited to speak out without restraint and to discuss all matters of state as at an open forum.

The radicals accepted this invitation with alacrity, and have been enjoying a field day shouting down capitalism and the "emperor system".

Copyright 1946 by HUMAN EVENTS, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is as it should be in a nation taking lessons in democracy.

What the democratic, as distinguished from the communistic, members of the occupation administration object to is not, it seems, the airing of Red ideas, but rather the Red bond which they think exists between Moscow and the Communists of Japan. As a Canadian Communist involved in the atomic bomb spy case recently admitted, Communists everywhere consider their allegiance to Moscow more important than their allegiance to the countries of their nationality.

But the Red bond, invisible and elusive, cannot be sundered by repressive measures, nor by diplomatic protest directed to the Soviet Government. Both methods have been tried in more countries than one and both have been found ineffectual. And it is not always easy to establish, save by circumstantial evidence, the existence of a link between the Kremlin and the Communists of any given country.

Enlightenment, coupled with economic betterment under capitalism, is the only effective weapon with which to cut the Red lassoes as thrown from the citadel of the ostensibly dissolved Communist International. Let propaganda of truth be pitted against propaganda of perversion.

III

Since Allied occupation, Communist magazines have mushroomed up in Japan. The most prominent of these, called Soviet Culture, in its current number, blandly asserts:

> "Among the world's nations today only the Soviet Union has not had economic chaos or social uneasiness. There is no unemployment in Russia. Prices are low and commodities are getting plentiful. . . . The Soviet election system is far more democratic than those of other nations. . . . It is true that the Soviet people have only one thought, but that does not mean that freedom of thought does not exist."

There is nothing objectionable in these broad assertions. Except for the fact that the magazine is presumably financed by outside sources for ulterior purposes, the editorial attitude is part of the game played universally in the sacrosanct name of freedom of speech.

And since outright falsehoods parade under the protection of freedom of speech, we must also invoke the same freedom to combat them. If the liberals of Japan really enjoyed freedom under the occupation authorities, it would not be difficult for them to enlighten their fellow-countrymen as to the true state of affairs in the Soviet Union, and thus rout propaganda of falsehood financed from alien sources.

A plethora of books and articles exploding the myth of Red Utopia has been published in America. Japanese liberals would, one may be sure, welcome and translate such publications, if they were free to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

publish them. But are they?

Let us explain this point with a concrete, though hypothetical, example. Kravchenko's I Chose Freedom; Bullitt's The Great Globe Itself; Krivitsky's In Stalin's Secret Service -- such books could readily be translated into Japanese and put on the market there. But would not the Soviet Government, as one of Japan's conquerors, demand that the Allied administration at Tokyo clamp down upon such publications, even though they were put out purely as a commercial enterprise? Judging from the great indignation with which Moscow greeted even such mild criticisms as were recently expressed by Mr. Brooks Atkinson in the New York Times, one may be sure that the Kremlin will not connive at the publication in a vanquished country of revelations far more devastating to Stalin's dictatorship.

The probable Soviet objection might be ignored or overriden by the Allied administration if the United States, the dominant Power in that administration, would itself take a tolerant view of the new freedom bestowed upon Japan. This would involve permission to translate and circulate American books of the nature of, let us say, Scott Nearing's Dollar Diplomacy, a denunciation of American "imperialism"; or of Ferdinand Lundberg's America's Sixty Families, an indictment of the zaibatsu on this side of the Pacific.

If the American representatives in the GHQ at Tokyo would not tolerate the dissemination of books unflattering to the United States, they would logically have to countenance Soviet objection to similar criticisms of the Russian situation. And the Japanese public would then see only that side of the foreign shield which the Allies, individually or collectively, would have it see. Such a public is more susceptible to Red propaganda than one free to read and write as it pleases.

Especially is this true where ignorance joins hands with hunger. And Mrs. Kanju Kato, feminist and "congresswoman", recently called on General MacArthur especially to tell him that "we are all of us very hungry". No doubt hunger has something to do with the mushrooming of Red publications in Japan, for starving scribes may be willing or forced to sacrifice their own consciences and convictions.

IV

Thanks to 15 years of "thought control", under militarist domination, Japan has developed a sort of intellectual vacuum. Its people, always avid, omnivorous readers, are starving for knowledge and information, particularly about the outside world. They crave free reading, free thinking, free discussion, with no controlling power hanging like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a sword of Damocles over their heads. When the victorious Allies proclaimed such freedom for the Japanese it was to them as though light had burst upon an arctic night.

Obviously the occupation authorities are constrained to exercise a certain amount of control over the proclaimed freedom. Such control is justifiable both to maintain the security of the occupation forces and to uphold the dignity and prestige of the Powers concerned.

Thus the Japanese press is restrained from reporting crimes committed by GIs, the increasing frequency of which caused Lieutenant General Eichelberger at Tokyo to issue a stern warning declaring that misconduct of American troops in Japan had reached a point of "endangering the mission of the occupation". Perhaps Japanese editors should voluntarily refrain from publishing news of this nature, even if permissible.

But there are far more important items which the Japanese press is not free to publish -- to which it is probably not allowed access -- but which, if published, might add greatly to the prestige of the United States. When, for instance, so distinguished an educator as Chancellor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, denounces the use of atomic bombs upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki as inhuman, unnecessary and a violation of International Law, it is important news and has been regarded as such in America. The denunciation strikes a responsive chord in the American heart, for, when all has been said and done, Americans are the most kind-hearted people on earth.

Suppose that President Hutchins' statements were widely published in Japan, what would be the Japanese reaction? I am certain that the Japanese would recognize in them America's real greatness -- a greatness not in terms of destructive and destructible bombs and guns and fleets but in terms of that lasting idealism and spirituality which, in the last analysis, constitutes the distinguishing quality of a great nation.

Americans, in retrospect, increasingly deplore the wholesale ejection of 100,000 Japanese from the Pacific Coast, in 1942. Professor Eugene V. Rostow, of Yale University, calls it "a threat to society and to all men". On the genesis of Pearl Harbor itself divergent views will develop in the years ahead, as indicated in the majority and minority reports of the congressional committee concerned.

In all these discussions the Japanese, if permitted to hear both sides, would see America's real greatness. For only a great nation is capable of admitting its own blunders and of criticizing its own rulers.

Reproduction or quotation is permitted only when credit is given to HUMAN EVENTS. Trial subscription, six weeks for $1. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year $15. Foreign rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective. Address circulation and business correspondence to: HUMAN EVENTS, 608 South Dearborn St., CHICAGO 5, ILLINOIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events VOL. III, NO. 31

By Frank C. Hanighen July 31, 1946

Secretary Byrnes left for the Paris Peace Conference photogenically hopeful, but verbally cautious. As in his July 15 radio speech, the Secretary talked lyrically of peace, with a resultant happy impression on the public. But he prudently provided his text with a sufficient quantity of qualifying clauses, so that any untoward events might later be "covered" by the record. As a matter of fact, the Conference is not authorized to tackle the principal problem -- the disposition of Germany. Its agenda is confined to consideration of the peace treaties with Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland and Italy; in short, with secondary, "periphery" problems. Even as to these the Conference can only make recommendations -- the power to decide rests with the Big Four. The 21-nation body, however, can serve as a forum which, by its moral effect, might influence the Big Powers in their final decisions.

A dispatch from Paris, by Paul W. Ward of the Baltimore Sun, suggests that the "road back to peace" is paved with fewer good intentions than it was at the Peace Conference of 27 years ago. Ward shows that the peacemakers of Paris this summer are much less interested in disarmament as a means of insuring peace than were their predecessors in 1919-20. The proposed documents today contain no such clause as the following which appeared in those signed in 1919 and 1920: "In order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of armaments of all nations, Germany [or Bulgaria, Austria or Hungary] undertakes strictly to observe the military, naval and air clauses . . ."

The provisions of the proposed peace treaties with Bulgaria and Hungary indicate that these defeated nations will be left at least twice as strong militarily as they were at the conclusion of the peace treaties after the last war. The treaties of 1919 and 1920 forbade enemy countries to have any military aircraft. Today, Bulgaria and Hungary may have fighter aircraft, but no bombers. Conquered countries in 1919-20 were forbidden to have compulsory military training; today's treaties contain no such prohibition. Italy was among the victors at the peace table in 1919-20; today it is a defeated nation. The proposed peace treaty will allow Italy to have a military force much larger than that permitted defeated Germany at Versailles (but still less than Yugoslavia's).

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The OPA situation now moves from the congressional to the bureaucratic arena. Certainly the new decontrol board, together with the Secretary of Agriculture, will have the power to make decontrol work; providing the members have the "know-how". Without the latter, trouble lies ahead. Already private business in various parts of the country is reportedly clashing with OPA administrators. From the beginning, obstructionism and lack of sympathy with business problems have marked OPA's handling of too many cases.

Even with the best knowledge and will on the part of the new board, it faces one difficult barrier -- the reluctance of a bureaucratic group to liquidate itself. Indeed this may have been the principal source of trouble in the past year. In theory, OPA was to re-establish, by gradual relaxation of controls, the free market; and thereby to bring about its own extinction. In practice, the OPA bureaucrats were apparently trying to perpetuate themselves by resisting decontrol.

This column has listened to Senators, even New Deal Senators, privately rage at what they considered a purely obstructive attitude on the part of OPA administrators

Copyright 1946 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in cases involving their constituents. On Capitol Hill there has long been a general feeling that the OPA objective was less to handle ceilings fairly and intelligently than to prevent the return to a free market; and that a considerable part of the OPA does not believe in or want a return to a free system. Observers are waiting to see how gracefully OPA will submit to the euthanasia promised by the new setup.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The facts about the bloody overthrow of the Villaroel Government in Bolivia last week -- as told to this column by reliable sources -- differ sharply from the widely accepted picture of a triumph of "democratic forces" over a pro-Nazi, reactionary President. These sources discount the claim that Villaroel was pro-Nazi. Far from being "reactionary", according to the pro-Labor Ernesto Gallarza of the Pan-American Union, Villaroel tried to enforce liberal labor legislation and had launched a progressive agricultural program to balance Bolivia's lopsided economy, which has been too dependent on tin exports. As for the "democratic forces" which staged the successful revolution, they included tin mining interests and Communists. The former did not like Villaroel's labor policy, nor his governmental control of foreign exchange. The latter discovered a "fascist" attitude in his reluctance to recognize Soviet Russia. Our State Department's role in the affair remains obscure, although it is known to have been unfriendly to the dead President and there are charges that it intervened in behalf of individuals implicated in an earlier abortive revolt against the recent Government.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

One unpublicized phenomenon -- the new state of mind of Mr. John L. Lewis -- considerably complicates the picture of political trends in American Labor. Since 1940, Mr. Lewis has been an ardent Republican, supporting that party at elections. Last year he was frequently in conference with prominent Republicans. At the Labor-Management Conference last fall, his economic views were close to those of Business, as well as the Republican Party. Privately, he was critical of President Truman and the Democratic Administration.

Today, following the coal strike, Mr. Lewis reportedly takes quite a different attitude. Those who have discussed the strike and the political situation with him find him bitterly resentful against Business in general, and against Eastern financial and industrial figures whom he considers responsible for the widespread opposition to his stand in the coal strike. Also, he is described as "disgusted" with -- "full of strange oaths" at -- the Republicans, particularly for their support of the Case bill. At the same time, Mr. Lewis utters not one word of criticism of President Truman and the Democratic Party. It is recalled that he has been friendly with Mr. Steelman, head of OWMR; and that now President Truman is reportedly on good terms with the miners' leader.

What this new attitude of Mr. Lewis presages, and how permanent it may be, no one can tell. The miners' leader has been volatile in politics. But if he fails to support the Republicans in the coming elections, the latter may suffer in certain states -- Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Illinois -- where the coal miner vote is important.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The Bretton Woods plan, now officially the International Fund and Bank, may or may not prove to be the anchorage for stable international monetary and financial conditions, but it certainly looks like the bureaucrats' haven or -- shall we say? -- heaven. Mr. Harry B. White, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, was the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chief architect of the plan. He was then enjoying a salary of $9,800, subject to U. S. income taxes. When the Fund and Bank were formally set up at Savannah last spring, he did not exactly discourage the American delegates, whom he headed and who dominated the meeting, from voting him a position as Executive Director of the Fund, at a salary of $17,000 a year, tax free. This represents about a 100 per cent increase in disposable income for Mr. White.

Other colleagues of Mr. White are similarly fortunate. Another Treasury official, Mr. Frank V. Coe, was named Secretary of the Fund at the salary of $12,000, tax free -- in contrast to his Treasury earnings of $9,800, less taxes. Two other Treasury officials also rose in the net salary scale: Messrs. Edward M. Bernstein and Ansel F. Luxford, from $9,800, less taxes, to new jobs with the Fund at $14,000, tax free. Mr. John Stam Hooker similarly left a position with the Financial Section of the State Department at a salary of $9,800, less taxes, to a position in the International Bank which brings him $11,500, tax free.

Now these salaries did not pass without criticism from other delegations to the Savannah meeting. The British were outspoken on this issue. After consulting the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Keynes said in part, " . . . in our view so large a body of persons cannot properly be remunerated on the very high level proposed, which equals or greatly exceeds the highest remuneration available in most countries for public service. My country feels, therefore, that they cannot share in any way the responsibility of this decision." But aside from this there was little open opposition, perhaps for the reason suggested in the following quotation from the Commercial and Financial Chronicle (April 4, 1946): "Various foreign delegates with whom the writer discussed the subject of salaries shared the British view, but -- since their governments expect to apply for dollar loans -- they did not dare to raise their voices against the American proposals."

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The projected Swedish loan to Russia has inspired animated comment from economic and political experts. Swedish authorities, it has been reported, are now working out a one billion kronor loan to Russia. The krona runs approximately 3.6 to an American dollar, so the proposed loan is the equivalent, in foreign exchange, of about $276,000,000. Actually, this figure does not bring out the magnitude of the loan. Sweden has eight million population; the United States 140 million. On the basis of this comparison, a Swedish loan of one billion kronor would work out to the same as a United States loan of six and a half billion dollars.

The economic motivation for such a colossal credit to Russia is said to spring from the ideas of Swedish Secretary of Commerce Gunnar Myrdal, who reportedly feels that Russia would provide a commercial counterbalance to the United States for Sweden. Myrdal does not believe the United States can maintain a steady level of prosperity and hence a reliable market for Swedish goods; but that "planned" Russian economy can do so. Gunnar Myrdal is a Socialist "planner" and famous economist, well known in Washington among the New Dealers, on whom he made a great impression when he predicted in 1943 that the United States would sink into the biggest depression of its history within six months to a year and a half after V-J Day. This forecast in part influenced the thinking of Washington bureaucrats who prophesied a big deflation at the end of the war.

Most observers lay great stress on the political motives for the Swedish loan to Russia. The Swedish Government is obviously desirous of convincing Moscow that Sweden does not belong to the "Western Bloc". It is not overlooked that Russia has large forces on Sweden's northern frontier, and that Finland no longer provides a military buffer for Sweden on the East. Sweden's inclination to grant such a loan is further evidence of the heavy weight which Russia has thrown into one side of the European balance scales.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes and Quotes

If it had not appeared in a newspaper of such high quality and reliability as the Christian Science Monitor, the following quotation would seem as incredible as it is depressing. But, after the appalling murder of millions of Jews, perhaps it is not surprising if the witches' cauldron of Europe should give off such noxious vapors. The Monitor (July 23) published a dispatch from its correspondent in the Balkans, R. H. Markham, portions of which follow: "One of the sad but unmistakable developments which I observed in Southeast Europe is a sharpening of the antagonism between Jews and Gentiles. This is, of course, anti-Semitism, but it is more than that. It is also anti-Gentilism. It is a mutual conflict.

"Many Gentiles there are engaged in a war against Jews and many Jews there are engaged in an equally bitter fight against Gentiles. . . . Many Jews are in power now in Romania and Hungary. I don't mean that they actually govern either country, but the group in power favors the Jews. So far as this springs from tolerance, it is a righteous attitude, but its practical result may sometimes be discrimination against Gentiles. Some Jews, remembering their persecution, are 'getting even'. Some have jobs which enable them to humiliate Romanians and do not refrain from doing so. . . . The Jewish question is taboo. Any Romanian who expresses resentment at real or alleged anti-Gentile discrimination in any sphere or on any occasion is in danger of being denounced as a 'hooligan' and may be arrested. . . . Since Romanians can't openly discuss the Jewish-Gentile problem they seem to spend half their time in private raging about it."

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

"The labels of Right and Left have really lost all sense in the present political scene, except as the one refers to the few existing remnants of genuine, oldtime capitalism, and the other to the anarchists, Trotskyites, and other even smaller remnants of oldtime revolution. And as long as these ancient labels continue to have more meaning for our minds than the things to which they are glued, we shall all of us fail in our political judgments concerning the way the world is wagging." The Commonweal, July 12, 1946.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The Report of the Canadian Royal Commission investigating the activities of the Russian-Communist espionage ring brings out this evidence: "Gouzenko [the renegade Russian spy, who gave the Commission much of its data] stated before us that the Communist International or 'Comintern', whose dissolution had been announced in Moscow to the world press on May 15 and June 10, 1943, continued to exist and to function secretly. The documents which Gouzenko brought with him corroborate his testimony."

This revelation adds importance to an announcement which HUMAN EVENTS wishes to make. On September 1, we shall publish a book, Blueprint for World Conquest, containing the Constitution, Program, Theses and Statutes of the Communist International, with an interpretative preface by William Henry Chamberlin. The texts of the above documents first appeared in Communist Party publications in 1921 and 1928 and are faithfully and completely reproduced in the forthcoming volume. We do not feel immodest in saying that this book is similar, in value and importance, to Hitler's Mein Kampf. As the latter gave an authoritative picture of the Nazi plans, so does Blueprint for World Conquest present the Comintern's own description of its aims, plans and techniques. We suggest to interested readers that they place their orders now for Blueprint for World Conquest (price $3.50) with our business office: address HUMAN EVENTS, Inc., 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Illinois.

1323 M STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON 5, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED